PRISM

AN ANGLICAN MONTHLY

APRIL 1960 Vol. III No. 12

RELIGION AT CAMBRIDGE

1s. 6d.

PRISM
NEEDS
REGULAR
SUBSCRIBERS

Editors
ROBIN DENNISTON
CHRISTOPHER MARTIN

Business Manager
ROBIN MINNEY

All subscriptions, cheques, articles and correspondence to :—
PRISM, 7, Tufton Street, London, S.W.1
Telephone : ABBey 3760

Subscription rates *(post free)* :
3 months, 5s.
6 months, 10s.
12 months, 20s.
Prism can also be obtained at Church bookshops

THIS MONTH

		Page
FOCUS		1
RELIGION AT CAMBRIDGE	Hugh Dickinson	1
POEM : SAINT PETER	Edith Anne Robertson	6
ON BEING HIGH CHURCH	Maximus Ironmaster	6
COMMENT		10
LANGUAGE AND THE LITURGICAL COMMISSION	Valerie Pitt	14
FLINTSTONE AND SPRINGING WELL	Iskra	19
A NEW MOVEMENT IN THE UNIVERSITIES	Raymond Chapman	22
CORRESPONDENCE		25
BOOKS		29
The Four Loves by C. S. Lewis		
Roman and Uncondemned by Dudley Symon		
Literature for the Anglican Communion		
WITH A MAN FROM CONGO		31

Focus

"The interest in religion is here today," writes Hugh Dickinson, from Cambridge in this number, "but how many of those who are interested in religion and the Social Gospel have asked themselves not 'What shall I do?', but also, 'What would God have me do?' "

Compared with the amount of preaching and discussion the amount of praying at Cambridge, he suggests, is inadequate.

At Oxford where the Archbishop of York recently preached an outstandingly successful mission, Trevor Huddleston, present in a pastoral capacity, said all his enquiries were about prayer—undergraduates wanted to find out, above all things, what God would have them do.

There is presumably more in this than the difference between Oxford and Cambridge, though differences in the religious situations of the two older universities can (and do) provide food for fascinating speculation.

There seems no more urgent task in the Church in general, and the prismatic outhouse in particular than to explore the question of how to pray for God's guidance. Last year Dom Robert Petitpierre conducted an imaginary correspondence in these pages which, though it baffled some, stimulated many.

We propose to go on from there with help from contributors and, particularly, correspondents, who we hope will continue to write to us and keep us assured that prayer is not just the ultimate solipsism.

Religion at Cambridge

HUGH DICKINSON

I have a horrid feeling that the Bishops are very happy about Cambridge. One pictures them with furrowed brows glooming over the weakness of the Church in this or that industrial city; over the scattered and broken-spirited clergy of the great country dioceses; over the inadequacies of the training of ordinands; and then turning with a relieved sigh to the Cambridge scene—perhaps poring with bright eyes over the latest edition of *Cambridge Opinion*. "Yes it *is* exciting," they murmur to each other, "isn't it? Quite like the Evangelical Revival—all those young men crowding into

Great St. Mary's—they're all Tomorrow's Leaders". "There *are* signs aren't there?" they ask each other wistfully.

What are the signs and what do they signify? *Cambridge Opinion* does a periodic survey of undergraduate attitudes and habits of life based on the 900-odd answers they get to the questionnaires they have devised to probe some particular aspect of student opinion. From their latest publication it appears that 33% of the student body belong to some religious society or group, while 66% are definitely prepared to call themselves Christian; 49% are professedly members of the Church of England. Of those who claim to be C. of E.—and unlike H.M. Armed Forces the university does offer "Agnostic" as a real and attractive alternative to party alliegiances —of these 61% go regularly to Church, 21% occasionally. These figures when compared to the statistics of the average parish are startling enough, and no-one who has squeezed himself into the crowded galleries of St. Mary the Great or perched uncomfortably in the aisles of Holy Trinity can pretend that there isn't something afoot. There are other "signs" too. Every College has posted up long lists of "war-on-want" lunches; no meeting about refugee or racial problems need fear that it may not get an audience; the Appointments Board now have a special advisor for those thinking of employment overseas in under-developed areas of the world; disarmament (nuclear) jostles shoulders with rearmament (moral) in a welter of earnest concern about the Fundamentals of Life.

Of course the ministry of Mervyn Stockwood at the University Church has underlined this state of affairs; to one who came in time only to see the tail end of his work here it seems fantastic that a congregation of—allegedly—eighteen could in three years be turned into a crowd of 900 or more; surprising particularly when one read the recently published sermons which achieved this huge acclaim. The subtlety of Newman or the profundity of Milford could fill a university Church, but these are strictly neither subtle nor profound. There is a sort of trenchant common sense about them, a readiness to use modern words and illustrations, a refreshing dislike of the "pi" or ecclesiastical, a determination to follow to the end the full implications of the faith as a social Gospel—all this certainly (and how welcome). But still at the end of it a little voice is asking somewhere in the back of the mind, "Is it as simple as this? Where is the mystery?" One effect which these sermons did invariably produce was that the congregation always left arguing. My impression is of groups of young men scattering into bright Sunday morning Cambridge—into pubs and punts or the shade of College gardens and of overhearing, "But of course Moses was really a Trades Unionist organising a Bricklayers strike". "Do you mean to say you think His body went *through* the wall?" "Well I think Baptism is just a lot of superstitious hooey". And of how many congregations is it true today that they feel it is worth arguing about what their pulpit tells them.

Dr. Stockwood has gone but the interest still grows unabated. Canon Fison finds his Church as full as did his predecessor; but he is wondering about the "signs" and so am I. Certainly there is a lot of religion about; and yet it would be revealing I am sure if one could get a percentage figure of affirmative answers to the question, "Has your religion had any direct bearing or influence on your choice of your career or profession?" 150 years ago the Evangelical Revival seems to have produced considerable public interest in the condition of those to whom the Gospel had never been preached; but also it produced here a great stream of men offering their lives to the service of that Gospel. The interest is here today but how many of those who are interested in religion and the social Gospel have asked themselves not, "What shall I do?" but also, "What would God have me do?" Heaven forfend that all religiously inclined young men should feel that they ought to offer themselves for ordination—but very few of those who go from the universities to theological Colleges have found their vocation while they were there. And the needs of Approved Schools, psychiatric work, probation work and so on though widely canvassed meet with no wide response. The Angry might interpret it as an indication that religion is a fashionable interest, not a way of life, but there is more to it than that.

The Chaplains get an insight into the problem on a very different level and while they recognise the fashionable element in a lot of religious activity I am sure fashion alone would not be any sort of adequate explanation in their eyes. The constant stream of individuals who come with their personal and religious troubles indicates a sense of need, of uncertainty, of genuine seeking for foundations which cannot be shaken. I believe that at least 15% of undergraduates would benefit to some material extent from professional psychiatric attention; a large proportion of one's time is spent with individuals who are sufficiently insecure to find life nearly impossible without some sort of regular support; many others are faced with the challenge of a new and terrifying freedom for the first time and find themselves totally lost; others are experiencing for the first time the stresses of adult relationships and cannot cope—or are simply lonely or unhappy. Fashion and speculative "interest" may help to create "signs" but the basic motive is personal need.

This is reflected in many ways but particularly in the readiness with which any creed is welcomed which will promise certainty, "fulfilment" (blessed word!) or a sense of direction. The CICCU flourishes and with it a good deal of fundamentalism; Chaplains can do a roaring trade on providing simple "instruction" for their flocks—"none of this business of thinking through round and under everything" as one of them put it. "Give 'em a rule of life and let 'em get on with it". The blessed assurance of the full rituals of the Catholic Church can stave off doubtful speculations as easily as the confident knowledge that one carries in one's pocket the Total

Truth bound in black morocco; (above all let us not *think*—particularly in a University).

So much for personal need as the chief motive behind these signs; signs therefore of a generation which has increasingly missed National Service, which is infected very often with its parents' doubt and insecurity and even more in many cases by its parents' failure as parents, and pressed in upon by all sorts of new tensions in a highly competitive world. But it would be quite wrong to paint the whole picture in terms of feebleness and insecurity. There is a great deal going on which shows very great enterprise and energy—though perhaps much of it would not be recognised by the conventional as "religious". Many undergraduates have testified to the fact that it was the experience of hearing eminent men delivering purely secular lectures in Great St. Mary's that brought home to them for the first time in a manner which the imagination could grasp that the Christian Faith might have some impact on the sort of life the *Daily Mirror* records and also something to learn from the agnosticism of distinguished men whose searching has been more intensive and more honest than anything which the average Christian allows himself to do. On the one hand there is a really profound concern for the problems of the Church in industrial society.

Roland Walls and Simon Phipps have abandoned the pleasant pastures of theorising about Industry in order to take up industrial work; frequent visits are paid by groups of undergraduates to industrial parishes or housing estates; a good deal of anger is generated over the obsolescence of the forms of worship and of thought which the establishment seems to be trying to preserve and propagate and perhaps a tendency to feel that anything the establishment favours must *ipso facto* be fuddy-duddy beyond words and totally unsuitable for the modern world. On the other hand there is what seems to me a wholly admirable determination to come to grips with agnosticism as a position of integrity both inside the faith and outside it. My predecessor used to say that the Chaplains' first job was to turn Christians into agnostics—a pointed way perhaps of saying that the Christian faith is concerned in a university particularly that men should pursue a truly exhaustive enquiry into the fundamental issues involved in belief and not be content with ready-made answers, however authoritatively they may be delivered. This is of course equally true for the agnostic—for if it is the case that a high percentage of those who believe do so for non-intellectual or even compulsive motives, the converse is equally true.

But, it may be asked, is there nothing more? The sheep both inside and outside are obviously being fed, the basic bread and butter of pastoral care is being provided, probably more intensively than in any other university in the world. But surely one expects of Cambridge at least some new and exciting trends of thought, a new Movement, a new presentation of the Gospel, some daring new experiments in Liturgy or insights into the organisation of the New

Church of the New Elizabethan Age? Is there nothing which might be causing the Bishops a little unease because of its theological or practical novelty—surely you Athenians will be inventing for us "some new thing".

But no. A few quiet experiments have been done by Clare and Caius in intercommunion and liturgy but on the whole the spirit of conservatism reigns unchallenged. The desert of Biblical Theology grows no implications for practical experiment in the modern world, and can certainly give no substantial answers to the questionings of the young men about the rôle of Church in the world today and so prevent their often justified dissatisfaction from becoming sour belly-aching—it would be terribly easy to turn their enthusiasm into the sort of bilious niggling which happily appears less frequently in *Prism* than it used to. It is probably true that it is only those who have no responsibility for action that can afford the luxury of Anger; but it is disheartening to find that preserving the *status quo* should figure so largely in the priorities of those to whom the young men would like to look for some sort of a lead. Those bright sparks who do promise some illumination quickly get snuffed by mitres and absorbed into Midland smog. H. A. Williams of Trinity alone remains to preach a Gospel which might disturb the conventional; it is an attempt worthy of a university as a seedbed of new thinking to analyse religious experience and motivation thoroughly in terms of psychological categories, and to try and see what conventional morality looks like under the microscope of the new understanding of the mechanics of the mind. The attempt is overdue and it has its dangers; and it is clearly still in the realm of the fulfilment of personal need and insecurity that such a Gospel will chiefly be powerful.

This could perhaps all be summed up by saying that the prevalent feeling in all this religious activity is a lack of direction, perhaps symptomatic of the unease of the Church as a whole. Authority—right or left—can tell us that the important thing is to keep going and not to bother one's head with where one may be getting. Stick to your Bible/Rule of life, my boy, and leave the rest to God; a good recipe for daily life but socially irresponsible and intellectually stultifying. No one ever preaches in Cambridge about sacrifice or heroic generosity, simply I believe because the preacher cannot tell his hearers in any practical way what is worth it—he cannot tell himself. There is no one with the passion or the vision to conjure from the future a vocation for the Church in the land which is powerful enough to capture men's imaginations in the present. If all one asks of the Church in a university is that it should fulfil the Lord's command to Feed My Sheep then it might be claimed that here it is doing its job with a moderate competence. But if we expect to find here either a message or a mission or even a supply of manpower for the National Church we may be a little disappointed. But perhaps not really surprised.

Saint Peter

The angry cock still quiet, I sleep;
  So near, so far,
  Far by my sin,
Near by thy mercy and thy grace.

My face so near thy tranquil face;
  My sin forgot,
  Thy woe forgot
While down the brook the traitors creep.

The angry cock still quiet, I sleep;
  And in my dream
  Birth and Death seem
To change their chairs. How deep I sleep!

Thy death my birth. And I disown!
  The angry bird
  Screams out *I heard*!
And I awake. And thou art gone.

More solemn than I had thought death
  This solemn Birth
  Thrusting me forth
To the unknown Kingdom through thy Death.

EDITH ANNE ROBERTSON

On Being High-Church

MAXIMUS IRONMASTER

The Evangelicals under Simeon discovered that there was more in Anglicanism than going to Church, and the Anglo-Catholics that there was more in going to Church than listening to sermons. Today the Church owes a great deal to both, but she is painfully aware that she cannot afford to rest on their laurels.

As I come to the altar every Friday, with the other two Anglicans of this place, I do so by courtesy of the Roman Catholics whose

guest I am.* I am a high churchman, and owe what appreciation I have of the value of frequent Communion, and my need for the sacrament of Penance chiefly to the battling Anglo-Catholics of the twenties. I cannot fail to feel the Catholic heritage I share with the Romans : nor can I fail to ask what it is that makes me, distinctively, an Anglican.

As that weekly celebration comes round, and as the days go by when I may not celebrate, I become more and more certain that it is not that I am something less than a Catholic, nor even that I am constrained by a different liturgy from that of the Roman church. I discover that the foundation of my difference is that I recognise different authorities. I differ because of my obedience, and all my differences depend from that.

Thirty years is a long time in this age of speed. The wise men who taught me were right in their day to dress Anglican worship in Roman clothes. For they were a mission to the Church of England from within. Their victories showed that the Church of England is still able to retain its Catholic values, and its witness to the full life of the Christian. But as I look back, I see a vitality which is not so obvious today. It would be sad to discover that in keeping to their old paths, the Anglo-Catholics have mistaken the means for the end.

We know now, more generally in the Church of England than ever before, the lessons which the Anglo-Catholics suffered to uphold. But ahead of us there is much to be learned. For in adopting a High-Church position we have kept our eyes on Rome too long. We have once more to discover what are the elements of Anglicanism itself, and what is their right proportion.

As far as Rome is concerned both means and end have changed. The ecclesiastical objects imported from Italy for the Anglicans in 1925 are many of them the very things which Romans are now removing from their churches. Many a Roman church today holds Benediction less frequently than some of our High Churches. The statues which remain in their churches are moved to leave free the altars, and the Blessed Sacrament itself is often taken from the centre to give place to the living Liturgy.

And the end is different too. More today than ever since the Counter-Reformation the Romans are set to make the Mass intelligible to all. Rubrics are re-read, and commentaries put in the hands of the faithful. Even the Offertory prayers and the Canon are often said audibly. They realise, as Cranmer did, that anything unfamiliar or unknown removes the opportunity of full devotional participation.

In the context of such activity the Romans cannot understand our desire to copy their liturgy. First, they have so many complaints about it themselves that to find, for example, that the Last Gospel is said in some Anglican churches by choice leaves them in astonish-

* This article has come from the continent.

ment. But they find still harder to understand a church which cannot regulate such matters more efficiently. Again the questions of order and obedience are the difference they find most striking.

Let us admit, of course, that the Prayer Book is not perfect. But let us not discuss the matter too closely with the priest who has never used it. He may receive each week the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, sent (in plain cover) from Rome. He may be scrupulous in his observance of the new rubrics, stick all the new Masses in his English Missal, and keep well ahead with his Breviary. But it is doubtful if, today, such a priest is continuing the mission of Anglo-Catholicism. Seen today from a Roman milieu this, the high church of thirty years since, is dying on its feet. We respected and loved those who fought for it in its youth, when it had a kingdom to conquer. But now, years after the victory, the Phoenix must go to the fire. For ahead there are fresh victories to win.

The Anglo-Catholic emphasis on Liturgy has caused them too long to take for granted the theology of the Church. Thanks to their early battles, the Church is now thinkable as a separate entity from the State. But there is a danger that the instruments of Catholic reform were too sharp. In some cases they have tended to cut a minority, albeit zealous and holy, away from the Church for whom their mission is necessary. Where this has happened, there follow two results, both equally disastrous.

The first visible result is that the very men who profess to understand the value of the episcopate stand apart from their bishops. They reject, on conscientious grounds, some of the very obligations to which they bound themselves by oath at their ordination. Their conscience is dangerously sensitive in matters of detail, but their conception of order often weak.

In practice this state is hard to appreciate, and hard to correct. But there is another result of Anglo-Catholic separatism, which should be more obvious. All of us can think of the high churchman who avoids contact with evangelicals—who may still even refer to them as "the Prots"—and who does not deign to attend the Ruri-decanal chapter meetings. Cut off from many of his brother clergy—however misguided many of them may be—he is cut off too from the majority of Anglican laity, the ones who "could not understand the service". Round such a man there is probably a knot, or more than a knot, of well-instructed laity who can speak of Christ in the same language. But further off are millions of Anglicans who need to learn what he can teach, but neither know his language nor dare to learn it. An Anglo-Catholic of this type is today defeating his own object.

Modern Roman Catholics have reacted strongly against the pattern of Catholic life to which these Anglo-Catholics were driven in reaction. They were driven to adopt Roman practices, because no comparable system was available. But their desire for the fullness of Catholic worship and their despair with the Anglican system drove them to accept too much too fast, and some were uncritical

enough to assimilate a good deal because it was Roman rather than because it was intrinsically good. Even such measures served a purpose in their time. But by now we have spent almost a whole century discovering that we can diverge from our formularies. Have we the faith to return to them, with our many partial lessons learned, and to present at once a united witness to our neighbour, and a united worship to God?

With the old Anglo-Catholicism on the way out, there are a good many who have followed the recent reforms of Rome with admiration and understanding. But how many will have the courage to apply these reforms in terms of the ordination oaths and the Prayer Book? If this could be achieved apart from the medievalism of Sarum and the individualism of the "Western rite", the high churchmen might bring their teaching once more within reach of all. For the time has come when it is out of date to be naughty, and frivolous to remain apart.

It is a time to remember the words which Newman uttered in circumstances equally grave, when in Tract 90 he wrote:

> "Our Church's strength would be irresistible, humanly speaking, were it but at unity with itself: if it remains divided, part against part, we shall see the energy which was meant to subdue the world preying upon itself . . . . Till we feel this, till we seek one another as brethren . . . . returning to each other in heart, and coming together to GOD to do for us what we cannot do for ourselves, no change can be for the better. Till we, her children, are stirred up to this religious course, let the Church, our Mother, sit still; let us be content to be in bondage; let us work in chains; let us submit to our imperfections as a punishment; let us go on teaching through the medium of indeterminate statements and inconsistent precedents, and principles but partially developed. We are not better than our fathers; let us bear to be what Hammond was, or Andrews, or Hooker; let us not faint under that body of death, which they bore about in patience; nor shrink from the penalty of sins, which they inherited from the age before them."

If our consciences tell us that we cannot submit to the Church of England with patience, are they strong enough to accept the disciplines required by Rome? If not, then surely as Christians we must seek and accept the obediences by which we are true members of our own Christian family. Either we are true Anglicans or we are not. No amount of make-believe can disguise this ultimate dilemma: and in any case there are no faults which set us further from the ideal of true Catholicism than disobedience and disorder. It is our licence that is so inexplicable to the Romans.

If therefore we are by God's grace to carry the Anglo-Catholic movement on as a living force into the future, if once more we are to walk through streets which house a praying people, the high

church movement must accept changes in a changing time. There are of course those who feel that they achieve this vitality by obeying each new utterance of the Roman magisterium, who see themselves as primarily members of the living Western Church, but by an accident cut off from their true obedience to Rome and the Universal Bishop. But no Anglican today can accept this position and the Prayer Book. And if he refuses to face his inconsistency, and continues to imitate Rome, he belongs nowhere. The obedience he might have to choose is perhaps difficult, but if there is a true Catholicity in the Church of England it must be possible. Its very difficulty will make it a firmer basis of unity. Anything less has the smell of dilettantism.

The most pressing need of all, and for all, is to rediscover what exactly it is to be an Anglican. Our great schemes for revision, alteration, and trimming have for so long been occupying our minds, that we have largely forgotten what it is that we are trying to revise. What was it that made the Rev. Fr. A. join the same church as the Rev. Mr. B.?

Uniformity cannot, and should never be our ultimate aim. But at a stage when diversity grows ever faster towards division, a temporary conformity may be the only thing left to bring us together into a vital and productive union. Tolerance is not enough : in the new Canons we see a glimpse of one of the greatest possibilities of our century, a positive and sacrificial acceptance of order and a renewal of that great liberator, obedience.

Perhaps this uniformity will be—from my Roman eyrie I believe it to be—the right strategy for the decade ahead. If so, we should all find it in our hearts to pay its price—if, that is, we were right to answer "I think it", when the Bishop asked, "Do you think in your heart, that you be truly called, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this Church of England . . .?"

Comment

Religion today at Cambridge may be adequate as a peg to hang a memory of religion at Oxford just after the last war. Religion there was mostly for the religious, but much stronger than any religious movement was the Ayer-type philosophy. Ayer himself was by then at London but Austin, Urmson, David Pears kept us logically analysing. Michael Foster was different; as an exponent of Plato and Hegel he could knock spots off the wide boys (whom he distrusted professionally, supposing rightly that they had not studied with sufficient care the philosophic texts they tore to pieces) but he couldn't, or wouldn't, cope with linguistic analysis. There

were, of course, many religious gatherings but they were sectarian, not ecumenical in the Cambridge sense. The best sect I ever encountered was grouped round Dick Milford, then at the University church, and was called the Colloquy. You didn't have to believe to belong and I remember the future headmaster of Bradfield, in a superb cottage garden in Beaumont Street, expounding prayer in terms of metaphor. Gradually so it seemed, the whole cosmos could be seen in this way, so that nothing was as we described it, nothing could be known *per se*, all was mystery. This might have been the oceanic feeling, of which Arthur Koestler talks. Though called a colloquy it was quite possible for complete silence to reign for several minutes at a time. Milford by this means and by all that he said seemed to show that only the truth was worth pursuing. It is difficult to listen either to a political manifesto or a sermon nowadays without wishing his standards were more widespread.

* * * *

SECOND THOUGHTS ON CONVOCATION. The joint session of the Convocations following Church Assembly was impressive and moving, with Mervyn Stockwood ripping through the Litany in Latin, and with the clergy of each Province massed very properly into two fighting units led (from the front) by their bishops. During the opening exchanges between the Archbishops, a spectator might well have supposed he had strayed into a rehearsal of *Richard II*, so well did the Plantagenet language fall new-minted from the lips of their Graces. The ceremonial and the dress gave dignity and solidarity, the matter discussed (lawful authority) important and the debate was endued with charity and intelligence. Why was it, one wondered, that all now seemed so right and so good? It may have been the absence of the House of Laity. From the gallery, one conclusion is paramount, though dangerous to hair restorer manufacturers; it is that baldness is much more distinguished, as well as distinctive, than hairfulness. In the church, Top People may not be thick on the ground but they are certainly thin on top.

* * * *

One can perhaps be born, or at least educated as well as become Anglican. Otherwise how can you explain the curious and heavenly sense of *déjà vu* that descends on the lay Reader when, after an afternoon devoted alternatively to sermon-writing, washing-up, separating children, searching Milner-White for something suitable about refugees and reading the *Observer*, he finally arrives at a little hillside church where the lights are already on and the bells are pealing. This parish church has no incumbent and a disastrous rectory, but the last man there left his mark, the bells are still rung every Sunday before Evensong, and the choir—of anything

up to 12—really knows how to lead the worship. The Office is correctly sung all through, with hymns and intercessions, the sermon is received in a stunned silence, the Reader after the last prayer trips over his cassock yet again and we depart for the Vestry and discuss local matters. This is not a missionizing church ; it is a small band praising God with muscles, voices and regular attendance.

* * * *

We find ourselves talking religion at cocktail parties. A Rhodesian authoress of great talent said she hated religion—all religion—(*tantum religo potuit suadere malorum*) and disliked our Lord because he was a bully and glorified suffering (v the Cross). So intelligent in other ways, she could not see that if she was prepared to talk about Gandhi she should equally be prepared to talk about Christ. "Oh, but you're religious," she said. "You talk a different language". We buried our mutual incomprehension in more whisky, wanting to battle on but knowing it was no good. Eventually our hostesses will hear we have been trying to convert their best guests. And then, of course, we shan't be invited to any more parties and the problem will solve itself.

* * * *

When everybody's somebody then nobody's anybody. Here is *Prism's* solution of the problems of (1) too few bishops, (2) too few Provinces, (3) frustrated suffragans, (4) antiquated parochial system, (5) unsatisfactory deacon-curates, (6) a supplementary ministry : make all bishops archbishops, all suffragans diocesans, all archdeacons suffragans, most rural deans archdeacons, all parish priests rural deans, all deacons priests, all lay readers deacons and all members of the P.C.C. Readers.

Or perhaps it's not as simple as that.

* * * *

Have *Prism* readers heard what Bishop Stephen Bayne is reported to have answered to a reporter who asked him what he was actually going to do as Executive Officer of the Anglican Communion. "Waal, I don't know. I'm like the mosquito in the nudist colony. I know what I gotta do but I don't know where to start."

* * * *

In amongst the lay-abouts, homicidal perverts and nymphos of Colin Wilson's new novel *Ritual in the Dark* is the recurring figure of a priest called, I'm afraid, Larry Carruthers. Father Curruthers is very ill and very ugly : to his bedroom, guarded by a housekeeper and a Hungarian priest-acolyte, come the main characters in this existential melodrama, and he is always about to be fearfully

wise and pastoral to them but somehow the occasion always slips away. The brooding ambiguous presence of Father Carruthers calls to mind the strange part played by pseudo-religious in Iris Murdoch's *The Bell*. What is it the enquirers want from the Church? That they need it is beyond doubt. Could we not go halfway and help them to find out for themselves?

* * * *

A MUFFLED CLANG FROM BOW BELLS. *A Correspondent writes:*—Only a draughty shell of St. Mary-le-Bow, in the City, still stands above ground, but below, the Crypt has been transformed and the Norman pillars and arches beautifully restored, with delightful furnishings, and a perfectly glorious engraved glass screen at the entrance. On February 24th Princess Margaret attended the Dedication. *Prism* admired the gorgeous scarlet and steel of the City Pikemen, and the lace, white gloves, and embroidered robes that disguised the hard-faced business men who welcomed her. Bow Bells rang out a muffled peal, on tape, and everybody who was anybody crowded down the narrow steps into the bright warm cozy chapel in the wake of the nobs. Someone passed the Bishop's crozier over the heads of the crowd and the service began. There was a good after-dinner speech lightly disguised as a sermon; the City men fidgeted and coughed as they leant forward into their hats for the prayers, and the sweet voices of the choir soared up in the anthems. Afterwards Fr. McCulloch in his matey style showed the Princess round the common-room cum snack-bar adjoining the chapel, and presented a line of worthies including Mr. King the architect and Mr. Hayward the artist. We all cheered; the Princess stepped into her car and purred away.

Another City Occasion; another famous old church at least started on the way back to life; all very pleasant, don't you think? But to achieve this miniscule result £85,000 has been used up, the church is £55,000 in debt and another £60,000 is wanted at once (*The Times*). And not fifty yards down Bow Lane is St. Mary Aldermary, with Canon Hood lurking within; on the other side of Cheapside is St. Lawrence Jewry, all magnificent with gold and oak. Up the road is St. Vedast and looming over all is the Cathedral Church of St. Paul. There is no lack of services, recitals, sermons, spiritual help and invitations to fellowship in the area. Then, even allowing that a good proportion of the vast sums mentioned have been or will be begged or bribed out of the enormous commercial corporations of the City, is there not still a great diversion of funds which the Church is miserably in need of? How can we go cap in hand asking for money to help save souls when thousands are poured away in marvellous but totally unnecessary restorations like this?

Language and the Liturgical Commission

Valerie Pitt

The Church of England has been revising its services for fifty odd years. This, by the reckoning of heaven is just time for the Psalmist's grass to wither, but to the liturgiologist and the parish priest it is a life-time's work. One generation follows another and still the only *legal* service book in the Church of England is the Prayer Book of 1662, and it is not difficult to imagine the Church's frustration if the present wave of revisions ebbs again to nothing. But our leaders are not blessed with much imagination: mind-misted with the industrial noises of the Canon Law machine they have refused to allow experimental use of the proposed Baptism and Confirmation Services. No doubt there would have been difficulties with Draft Canon XIII, but still the refusal is a bad psychological error, not least because it inhibits informed discussion. Baptism and Confirmation are rites, they are things done, and things said, not words on the printed page. We cannot tell what the effect of the Liturgical Commission's new Rites will be until they have actually been used. Nor, as any parish priest could tell the Bishops, are artificial demonstrations with liturgical dolls likely to be a substitute for the pastoral use of the services.

Convocation did manage to spare time from the discussion of its own headgear to consider the worship of the Church. But what it had to say was not very sensible or helpful. Lachrymose nostalgia for the beauties of a Prayer Book which no one uses unmodified, is not at this stage relevant. But if the critics of the Commission's services are irritating, their friends are infuriating. "What", they say, "Criticism! How shocking. Can we not trust the experts? After all, it is only because the services are new that you dislike them." This is a rejection of responsibility. The Liturgical Commission is an estimable body, but no Vatican decree applies to it, and it has of itself no *ius liturgicum*. It would indeed be hard if it saw no result for its labours, but the Church has no duty to accept its proposals just because some of its members are experts and all have worked hard. The new services have to be a fitting vehicle for the Church's worship, and they will have to stand the wear of generations. It is right that they should be modified, even perhaps rejected, if they cannot stand up to close and critical scrutiny. It is even less desirable that the Church should accept its forms of

worship on the *say so* of experts, than that it should continue to waste its time with endless revisions.

For experts are fallible and even the words on the page show these services as open to criticism. The Archbishop of York, their most formidable critic, finds them defective both in content and in expression. The theology of the rites is not within my competence to discuss. The language is. To say that the language is defective is not all to regret, in the manner of the romantics, the *beautiful words* of 1662. It is my own conviction that the difficulties of 1662 are much exaggerated. But that is beside the point. What is wrong with the new services is not that they are written in modern English . . . for they are not . . . but that they are badly written. Here is a typical prayer :

> Almighty God our heavenly Father, who in every generation dost bestow new sons and daughters upon thy Church, Grant that these infants may be born again of water and the Spirit; that daily increasing in knowledge and love of thee, they may evermore be numbered among the children of thine adoption.

This does not make sense. Are the sons and daughters God's children bestowed on the Church in Baptism, or are the children first born of water, and then adopted by God, or is it their own perseverance in the faith, not the water and the Spirit, which is the agent of their adoption. One foresees endless Gorham cases on the strength of the ambiguities in this one prayer. And this is a simple matter of language. The syntax of the sentence is not shaped to the logic of any *single* idea in the Commission's mind. God is the subject both of the verb *to bestow*, and of the verb *to grant*, verbs which mean very nearly the same thing : what he gives is first the children and then the birth, and the meaning here is not made easier by the fact that God grant (understood) is also the verb governing the last clause. The prayer is not only muddled but so badly balanced that it is difficult for the speaking voice to modulate to the meaning. The natural stresses fall on unimportant words, and there is so little variety of stress in the prayer that it is difficult for an untrained person to make anything but a mumbling monotony of it. Now there is no reason at all why a modern liturgy should be ugly and incoherent. The Commissioners write like this because they have given insufficient thought to what they call the *prayability* of the services. They have a theory. Every writer knows that to write from a theory is fatal, and in this case the theory is inadequate. The language of liturgy, they tell us, must not only be intelligible, it must also be *hieratic*. An hieratic language is a special ecclesiastical language, like Church Latin, and it is exclusive of the normal uses of everyday speech. So for the rich directness of Cranmerian prose, and the dignified plainness of the Caroline Revisions they substitute a stockbrokers' tudor in ecclesiastical English.

Now the English of the Prayer Book was never simply a priestly language. There is a common assumption that what is unintelligible in Cranmer's English is its vocabulary. But this is not true: with the exception of certain theological expressions most of the words in the Prayer Book are still in common use:

> *Ye* perceive how by his outward gesture and *deed* he *declared* his good will toward them; for he embraced them in his arms, he laid his hands upon them, and blessed them. Doubt *ye* not therefore, but earnestly believe, that he will *likewise* favourably receive this present Infant; that he will embrace him with the arms of his mercy; that he will give *unto* him the blessing of eternal life, and make him *partaker* of his *everlasting* kingdom.

We would not expect the italicized words to be, in the senses used here, in a normal vocabulary, though it would not be unreasonable to expect an educated person to know them. All the others are in everyday use, and, given the exception of technical terms, it would be difficult to find any passage in the Prayer Book in which eighty per cent of the vocabulary was not current English. What is unfamiliar is the idiom and syntax. We should say *this child here*, not *this present infant*, and the sentence would turn out like this:

> Do not doubt, but believe that he will also receive this child favourably.

Now the Commissioners in their search for intelligibility have thinned out their vocabulary, though they still choose to use words like *bestow* which are in fact obsolescent, and in their search for the hieratic they have retained the Prayer Book idiom, and what they believe to be its syntax. Hallowed phrases and images turn up in contexts which give them a bizarre meaning. We are asked for instance to pray that these children *may be grafted into the Body of Christ*, which is odd enough, but immediately afterwards, with no transition, that they may continue in a family, and grow stronger *in a warfare.*

Now the point which the Commissioners may have missed is that this language was real and alive to Cranmer and his collaborators. They were not writing a priestly English, but the English of More, and Tyndale, Fisher, and Ascham, Humanist, and Divine, Protestant, and Catholic, the English of the educated man of the period. Cranmer wrote from an exceptional talent, and for a special purpose, but he was not creating a language. If anything, he was simpler and more traditional than his contemporaries, and his style is a function of his purpose, that is to be listened to, and understood. It is our common mistake to speak as if the Prayer Book's beauty were aesthetic, a matter of decoration, as if it were in fact Elizabethan or Jacobean, and not Henrician writing. There were

ornate writers in the earlier sixteenth century, but the common conventions ran to plainness and vigour, to the beauty which is not ornamental but functional. Balance, clarity and vigour are Cranmer's stylistic virtues, and they arise from his consciousness that his services had to be heard and used by a people far less literate—in the sense that they could not read from the printed page, but had to rely on their ears—than our people are. It is more difficult to take things in when they are heard than when they are seen. The process is slower to begin with, and, without tape recorders, it is impossible to double back and check the argument. Good speakers recognise this. They know that speaking not only allows, but almost demands a more emphatic rhythm than the printed word: they know that they not only can, but must repeat themselves, and the less learned the audience, the less familiar it is with the ideas they are expressing, the more they are obliged to play variations on the same tune. Cranmer, of course, was accustomed to this kind of composition, and he had the advantages of the long tradition of English Homiletic writing from which he derives most of the technical devices which he uses to assist the ear and the voice:

> Here we *offer and present* unto thee | O Lord | *our*selves, *our souls* and bodies || to be a reasonable, h*o*ly, and li*v*ely sacrifice unto thee . . . . .
>
> Although we be unworthy | , through our manifold sins | to offer unto thee any sacrifice (i) yet we *beseech* thee to accept this our *bound*en *duty and service* (ii) not weighing our merits || but pardoning our ofFences . . . .

Repetition, the doublet, the alliteration of word and phrase, and above all the superb balancing of clause against clause impose themselves on the voice, so that only the deliberate perversity of clergymen trying to get through the service at a rate faster than the words allow can entirely defeat the meaning of the prayer. For this balance of syntax is made, and especially in the collects, to develop the logic of the prayers.

> O God, for as much as without thee | we are not able to please thee | Mercifully grant that thy Holy Spirit may in all things *direct and rule* our hearts . . . .

The attempt to use this kind of device purely for ornament has betrayed all modern revisors. They have not seen what Cranmer is up to, and for his firm and economical syntax, substitute a nineteenth century flow of high sounding phrases.

The Liturgical Commission, certainly, suffer under grave disadvantages in attempting to preserve what they think to be a hieratic mode of writing. They are evidently frightened of verbosity, and have a phobia about keeping the services short. So they try to put in everything at once. Their prayer for the Blessing of the Water is too long to quote here but it is a perfect example of what Cranmer would

not do. He is aware of the value of repetition, and is content to play on the same string over and over again. The Commission contrives in twenty lines of large print to touch on Creation, the Fall, Christology, the Holy Ghost and the Church. This is too much for any congregation, concentrating on the baby, to take in, and certainly too much for any adult catechumen to manage in the few minutes before he receives the Sacrament of Baptism. Nor is the congregation helped by the Commission's sense of the rhythm and balance of sentences. The Bishop's homily runs like this :

> We read in the Prophet Ezekiel how God promised his people that he would gather them into their own land, that he would wash them from their sins, and that he would give them a new Spirit and renew their hearts within them.

There is no balance here, only sequence, and as the homily runs through its entire length adding indirect statement to indirect statement (*We learn that . . . St. Paul declares that . . . and that. Know then that . . .*) the whole thing appears like a catalogue, or with two references in consecutive sentences to *this same Spirit*, an inventory of God's mercies. The Commissioners are trying to employ a syntax to which their ear is not attuned, and of which they do not understand the working. The problems of the vocative construction (Almighty . . . God who alone workest great marvels send . . .) and of the long tudor sentence, are not easily solved except by the use of devices which are unnatural in modern English. And what we see the Commission doing in the prayer for the Blessing of the Water, is to impose on a basically modern sentence, the syntactical methods of the sixteenth century. This prayer is modelled, rather obviously, on the Eucharistic prayer in the Communion service, and this raises some worrying theological difficulties ; but it is perhaps as well to suggest that, whatever the theology, this type of long invocation is liable to very considerable literary difficulties especially for those without a tradition of spoken prose to help them.

What then is to be done? The first thing is for the Church as a whole to stop talking about *communication*. This is only a pseudo-subject amongst the many which distracts us from our proper business. Our question is what do we say and how do we say it. The answer is partly a matter of theory, but still more a matter of careful and disciplined practice, and of respect both for language and for meaning. We must do this because the language of worship is the language of the Church. If our sermons, and books and reports are shoddy and careless then our liturgy will be either shoddy or sham.

Secondly, we must recognise that Liturgical Scholars are not literary geniuses, and liturgy is a work of literary art as well as of historical scholarship. We will have to make up our own minds in what mode we want the services to be written . . . and I think we will

have to abandon the Cranmerian idiom, though not the Cranmerian principles. But having made up our mind we must either see that the Dean of York is given companions who are literary scholars, or writers; or we must adopt the Archbishop of York's suggestion, and appoint people to write the services. I am nominating the Warden Elect of Keble: since we are blessed with one theologian who writes like an angel why should we look further? And having arranged all this, for heaven's sake let us have a proper machinery for controlled experiment. I fail myself to understand why the Commission got as far as presenting a Report on Services which had not been widely experimented with all over the country.

And a final suggestion. Have the Commission a tape recorder? If not, will the Bishops buy them one?

Flintstone and Springing Well

I SUPPOSE EVERYBODY is now familiar with those ghastly Church of England statistics, which show that while we baptise about 60% of the population, only about one-third of these are confirmed. We have known this for many years, but so far there seems to be no determined and large scale plan to do anything about it. The most hopeful attempt was the unfortunately named campaign Operation Firm Faith. It was a hideous name because it described in terms of a military operation something which was military only in a Pickwickian sense. That is to say no one quite knew what it was for; or who had planned it; and it was allowed to peter out. It also managed to use pseudo-military language at just about the time that everyone else was getting fed up with it. Its object however was excellent. For it tried to do something about the fearful situation which has arisen after a hundred or so years of the separatist Sunday School movement, which, whatever may have been the intentions of the promoters, has probably done more to undermine Christian life in the country than any other single factor. Where must we look to for the so-called "leakage" between baptism and confirmation? In many directions at once, as usual. Some people wish to achieve an appearance of improvement by restricting the numbers of those baptised. They are not clear as to how this shall happen nor have they succeeded in commending their views to the Church as a whole. What is clear is that, except in a very small minority, there is no *sens de dieu* in ordinary family

life. Even where there is support (as it is called) for the Church, it is usually conceived as the bolstering up of a device which reflects certain peculiarities of our national culture and so keeps God and his terrifying demands at arm's length. "We like them to go to church but . . ." is the most characteristic remark of *approved* types of parents, when their offspring betray a desire to communicate frequently, or early ; to examine themselves ; to confess their sins,— to go to a retreat ; to offer themselves for some costing and sacrificial vocation. It is this notion, that the Church of England is the only thing which stands between us and religion, which is the prevailing note of our sub-Christian character ; and we have been promoting it for hundreds of years. While we meet the problem at a very humble level in day-to-day parish life, it stems from a fundamental problem to which some attention has been paid in the bible. In a conflict between culture and faith, does faith have to submit to modification by the culture ; or does the culture have to be remodelled by the faith? The calm assumption of supernatural approval of things and attitudes because they are English or Anglican lies behind many of our dilemmas.

IF A RESERVOIR is mysteriously emptying itself, it may be that much of the water is running away from undetected sources ; but it can be that someone is stealing it. It might be worth-while for our Statistical Unit to turn its attention to some sociological studies and see what happens to these children. It is true that many do not grow up with a family background which reflects this *sens de dieu* that we have spoken about ; but a very large number of them are in fact whisked off to Sunday educational activities organised by non-Anglicans. It is possible that the unexpressed recognition of this, which all clergymen know very well, is one of the real unacknowleged causes of distrust between Anglicans and unity-seeking non-Anglicans. Let us face it honestly and charitably. Is it equally honest and charitable for devoted non-Anglican Christian workers to be excessively zealous in whisking off to Sunday School Anglican children, who will hardly ever become real members of these bodies and for whom their short periods of Free Church indoctrination only succeeds in depriving them of their Anglican birthright, without really giving them anything else? The statistics of the English Free Churches speak for themselves. It is also lamentably true that a stiff and starchy church life, which has only the remote austerities of Anglican liturgy, in its most formal guise, is not the best calculated food for children isolated from a Christian family life. The simple and warmer life led by devoted and sincere Christians of the ordinary Free Church Sunday School is much more likely to attract them ; at least, for a time. But these wither away ; for their roots are elsewhere. I deliberately ask the hard question whether this persistent child-stealing is morally defensible? I am sure it is the source of deep distrust on the part particularly of Anglican clergy. No one

ever has the courage to say it in plain language. We say it here. We believe it to be morally reprehensible and that it should lie heavy on many consciences.

IT SHOULD LIE equally heavy on *our* consciences that we do not demand much harder work and more sustained effort at building up family religion, both in the ordering of church services at sensible times and in reasonable manner, as well as in the Christian rituals of the home. "Family prayer" is not enough; and anyway deficient in stylised *actions*. What would the tradition of Jewish family life be without these family rituals at fixed times and on fixed days and by different people? It is no use a bishop here and a bishop there talking in general about "the decay of family religion". It is necessary that throughout the whole Anglican world, clear and precise plans of action should be determined upon new and sustained for fifty or even a hundred years. There is nothing sub-Christian in loyalty and discipline and devotion, nor anything odd in a Christian family finding itself at odds with social patterns and conventions. Indeed, if it were a little more different, there might appear to be something specifically different to differ about. And this is only exceptionally the case.

ALONGSIDE ALL THIS is the frightful fact, that of the 9 million confirmed only $2\frac{3}{4}$ million made their Easter Communion. Surely all else in the Church pales beside this! Should any gathering of clergy or laity, severally or jointly, be allowed to gather without this terrifying disgrace being referred to; and plans made to rectify it? The missing millions are not just figures which, if corrected, would make church statistics look less shameful. They represent millions of immortal souls who have either been badly instructed, or have fallen by the wayside, or have caught the mood from the rest of us that Christian life and devotion is *not supremely important*; but is rather just one of those things . . . We need to put a stop to the eternal preoccupation which has exercised the Church of England since 1920, with schemes concerning its relations with other Christians; we need instead a God directed, Christ-loving, concern for our own people. Take a look at the time and energy spent since that year on such activities, and compare it with what has been devoted to concentrated and sustained campaigns to improve these terrible figures. It will shock you. Is there a single diocese which has had the courage to follow its bishop in a sustained campaign of visiting, teaching, reconciling, throughout a whole Lent, so as to recover these lost sheep? Suppose we gave up these ghastly Lenten services for the interminably devout, and worked according to a disciplined and consistent plan at the task of lay visitation of every family in every parish, with the knowledge that this above all was the compassionate task to which we are being driven. You will not have a Christian concern for justice in the world at large unless there

are some Christians. There are few things which would do more to invigorate our rather jaded church life as such sustained and informed and committed campaigns of mass parochial visitation. Meanwhile we shall continue to waste our time and energies upon tasks about which we may endlessly talk piously: but at no point *will they commit us to any action.* We shall preen ourselves with satisfaction if the figures this Easter climb from $2\frac{3}{4}$ millions to something a bit closer to that elusive 3 millions.

It would be ridiculous to be put off by the absurd criticism that we are merely asking people to please us by coming along to church once at least a year to oblige us, and to make a show at Christian respectability. If we take what we have been learning in these last years seriously, we shall want to tell them, and give them a chance to rediscover for themselves, the Paschal Mystery, and just what being a baptised Christian really means. We shall not be content indefinitely with a church which tolerates theological colleges which either suppress the fact that the Church has a ministry of reconciliation; or even attempts to persuade priests not to exercise it; we shall not for ever be content with a parish life which is content simply to hold up a too familiar statistical average. We shall not need to be reminded for ever that "numbers do not matter" for we shall know that every number represents a man, a woman, or a child, made in the divine image, and being remade in the image of the Son of God.

I think it was some such concern as this which sparked off last month's anonymous outburst against Convocation, which was not written by

ISKRA

A New Movement in the Universities

RAYMOND CHAPMAN

There are few examples of linguistic usage in modern English which are more misleading than the name "University". In their present state, the centres of higher learning reflect only too faithfully the fragmented picture of the community which they serve. The sense of belonging to a body corporate for the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge and wisdom is seldom to be found among the students.

If they are more concerned with what their degree will give them in terms of bargaining power, it is a sad comment on the whole comtemporary scale of values rather than on their quality as a new generation. Dons are too often as "remote and ineffectual" as the one whom Belloc attacked ; a recent newspaper correspondence has even provoked some of them to make the remarkable assertion that teaching is not the main concern of the University teacher. For a good many years now, our Universities have seemed either unable or unwilling to consider the ultimate values of what they continue to teach.

It is not surprising therefore that Anglican students should have tended to submerge their faith in the prevailing vagueness and timidity. Not until the establishment of Chaplaincies with special pastoral care of students and senior members did the special opportunity and responsibility of the Church within the Universities come to be realised. The exciting revival of worship and study, the attempt to work out how the Christian life is to be lived within the rather artificial University world—these are very recent developments. They prove once again how necessary it is for the Church not to be tied to the parochial system, to recognise that the primary loyalty today is seldom to the place of residence. When most students outside Oxford and Cambridge were living at home, there was little need for a special ministry. The situation is vastly different now.

There has been a national conference of Anglican students every year since 1955. In this year it was first suggested that an association was needed to link up students all over the country, providing a more effective means of exchange and expression than a mere annual gathering of delegates. The suggestion was then rejected, mainly because a defensive and nervous attitude still prevailed. Students are notably old-fashioned in some ways, and they had not grown out of the idea that the Church of England was meant to be a kind of lowest common denominator for those who had no clear convictions about religion. This has not been true for some time except perhaps in the army, but Anglicans are only now beginning to accept and declare the positive nature of their commitment. In 1959, the report of the conference showed that the demand for a permanent association was growing. The conference held at Leeds in January of this year unanimously resolved that positive action should be taken.

One of the most important proposals for the new association is that it should have links both forwards and backwards in time. It is recognised that students include far more than those reading for degrees. As well as undergraduates, therefore, membership will be open to those at teacher's colleges, polytechnics and nursing schools. Further, there will be provision for a pre-university entry and for a graduate section. The wisdom of this wide range cannot be too strongly commended. One of the major problems in the Universities

is the gap between the sixth form and the first year as a student. There are many problems of academic and personal adjustment, even after the best Advanced Level teaching, and anything which can increase liaison is to be welcomed. Recent graduates are also a problem. They tend to lose touch very quickly, and indeed it is hard to keep up academic connections in a new job far away from the town where undergraduate years were passed.

It is intended that membership of the new Association shall be individual and not dependent on the existence of a local group. Nevertheless, the principal activities of corporate worship, study and social meetings will generally be arranged by groups federated to the main body. Members from wider areas will be able to meet at conferences and other national gatherings. It is strongly felt that the local groups must be free to conduct their own affairs and to make their own decisions on ecumenical relationships.

A working committee has been set up, in the hope that the scheme can be fully launched at a conference in January, 1961. Discussions are being carried on with many interested people; the Bishop of Peterborough, who has already given much encouragement, is to see members of the committee in the spring. At present all work is being done voluntarily, but it is hoped that a paid secretary may be possible later, perhaps with the help of the Church of England Board of Education.

Further information, as it becomes available, may be obtained from 33 Doughty Street, London, W.C.1. Inquiries should *not* be sent to the writer of this article, who is merely a don trying not to be too remote and ineffectual. The committee will be grateful for any offers of help and any suggestions about the Association's form and activities. All sympathisers can assist with their prayers this new attempt to prove that "Church of England" is not the theological equivalent of "Don't know". Lest this should be thought a retreat from the ecumenical hope, let us pray also that in learning more about ourselves we shall come to understand the position of those who are unhappily separated from us.

NEXT MONTH

MURRAY SAYLE, a young Australian expatriate, publishes his first novel, reports in *Encounter*, and writes in *PRISM* on

. . . The Ambiguous Image of the C. of E.

Correspondence

MORE BISHOPS?

Dear Sir,

The cry for more bishops is being heard on all sides and from some quite unexpected voices. But are we, in fact, asking for more of what we already have? It is not a question of believing that bishops, being of the *bene esse* of the Church are a Good Thing and one cannot have too much of a Good Thing but that bishops are of the *esse* of the Church, though, as we have them at present, they are sometimes not at all a Good Thing and, perhaps, the fewer the better. But is what we have at present really episcopacy at all or is it prelacy? In England we always have had prelacy and, for that matter, in most places north of the Alps; but must we accept this pattern for all time? The Right Reverend clergymen who now occupy the *cathedras* of England are probably trying harder to be bishops than at any time in the long history of *Ecclesia Anglicana* before or after the reformation and succeeding as far as it is possible. But this cannot be very far because the prelate's job is not a bishop's job and the Church suffers if a prelate tries to be a bishop, just as a ship suffers if the Captain tries to be a good Divisional Officer.

The Right Reverend Clergyman—what an expression! It ought, of course, to be the Right Reverend Fathers in God—but that is just what bishops as we have them now are not, in spite of the magnificent attempts at it that many of them make. Imagine a father with 600-odd children. And that is counting the clergy only to whom the bishop should be, in a special way, a father. If one counts the laity—and why not—well, how many children does that make? A father's job is to love his children; how can he love them if he has never seen, nor can hope ever to see, nine-tenths of them? Episcopal Fathers—real bishops—can be found, in the Anglican Communion, in the mission field. Missionary bishops are not better men, or even better clergymen, than English bishops; but they have a possible job. If we want episcopacy here and not merely prelacy, we must aim at having a bishop in charge of not more than 50 parishes. He could then know all his clergy well and a fair proportion of his lay people a little: he could, in fact, be a father.

This is revolutionary for it means not a few more bishops but at least ten times as many. We can still have prelates if they prove to be a Good Thing. That could be decided on its merit: is prelacy of the *bene esse* of the church? If not we can do without them. If they are then let them have the ancient and historic titles, cathedrals and palaces. We shall need some more money but Planned Giving has proved that there is plenty to be had for the asking. The prelates could all be Archbishops and Metropolitans. There are 17 Archbishops and Metropolitans in France and heaven knows how many in Italy: why should we be rationed to two? But we can wait and see how prelacy turns out. We cannot wait and see how episcopacy turns out: it is of the *esse* of the Catholic Church, given by God into man's hands, a mould for him to use. At present, and for hundreds of years past, in most places, the mould has been used to shape not bishops but prelates. We could waste a lot of time trying to discover whose fault that was (perhaps the Emperor Constantine?) but we would do better to realise that the mould has not changed. It can still be used to produce bishops who are shepherds and fathers with a flock and family small enough to be known and loved *by name*. What might not be the effect on the reunion of Christendom of this manifestation of episcopacy at work? Perhaps before we recommend the non-episcopal churches to take episcopacy into their systems, we might revive it in our own. The result might astonish in more than one way.

Yours faithfully,

(Rev.) GERALD FITZGERALD.

HIGHGATE.

INTELLIGENT NON-AGNOSTIC

Dear Sir,

Thank you for the review of my book, *The Intelligent Agnostic's Intro-*

duction to Christianity in your January issue.

In the interest of factual accuracy, may I point out: (1) I do not say that God is "almighty, but not omnipotent". I argue, on linguistic grounds from scripture, that one cannot *assume* that God is omnipotent (pp. 25-7). Of "almighty", I say that this word "might conceivably be used, without undue distortion, to express a sense of overwhelming, but not necessarily unlimited, power", whereas "omnipotent" clearly could not (p. 26). (2) The sentence you print between inverted commas, we "dive down with a flash of humour to the immutable kernel of the matter", is, in the original (p. 56): "This, like so many other popular sayings, dives down in a flash of humour to the *unconscious* kernel of the matter". The term "immutable" occurs in your review three times, two of which are in quotation: in my book, it only occurs once, on p. 130, where it is used, not of God, but *liturgically*, of an element in the ritual of the passover. (3) It seems to me also that the expression "*Gestalt* does more than Milton can . . .", which you print between inverted commas, may, in the context, naturally be taken by your readers to be a quotation from my book. It does not in fact occur there. The psychological influence in my work is not "*Gestalt*" but C. G. Jung.

May I add that I am sincerely sorry if I have irritated your reviewer? I cast my argument deliberately into a provocative form, hoping in this way to arrest the attention of the Agnostic!

Yours sincerely,

EUGENE ROLFE.

(Our reviewer writes: "*But Mr. Rolfe is looking for a substitute for metaphysical truth and that is why he goes to such lengths to uphold almighty rather than omnipotent.*

"*So his kernel is unconscious and not immutable; I am sorry, but I still have to learn to dive down into it with a flash of humour.*

"*Yes, I certainly had 'immutable' on the brain that day; what the devil can have produced this fixation? At any rate Mr. Rolfe rightly insists that the Milton joke is mine. Barring treble quotation marks, ' ' ' . ., I don't see how this could have been made clear*"—EDITORS.)

NORTH KENSINGTON HOUSING

Sir,

It was with particular distress that I read an article by your North Kensington correspondent (*Prism*, January) which, let me put it as mildly as I can, I thought to be both inaccurate and likely to do damage. Let me take one single example: ". . . the Council has the power to bring cases of excessive rents before the Tribunal without reference to the tenant or the landlord, but the Tory-controlled Borough Council persistently refuses to do so" and adds "it would seem that the elected representatives prefer to hide behind the myth that 'life's better under the Conservatives' ".

The subject of overcharging by landlords was long and earnestly debated both in committee and in full council and it was unanimously decided that the Council would take cases of overcharging to the Rent Tribunal where there was sufficient evidence to justify doing so and the tenant was willing. This decision was given wide publicity and should be known to anyone interested in North Kensington; but by publicly conveying the impression that the Council is unwilling to take cases of overcharging to the Tribunal your correspondent is undoing the very work which the Council is trying to do.

May I add that if your correspondent really wishes to help and he or any of your readers can produce cases in which there is clear evidence of overcharging and the tenant is willing for proceedings to be taken (these proceedings can in fact be taken without the tenant being directly involved) either the Town Clerk or any of the Conservative Councillors would gladly see that these cases were pursued.

It may on first sight seem to your readers unreasonable that proceedings should be taken only when the tenant is willing for this to be done; but this aspect too was long and sincerely debated, and the conclusion was reached that it would be wrong to take action in opposition to the wishes of the tenant because (a) this would be an interference with the liberties of the subject, (b) it might result in damage to the interests of the tenant through no fault of his own, and (c) it would be

likely to lead to the dismissal of the case by the Tribunal for lack of evidence and thus prejudice the bringing of future cases in which there was a good chance of success.

I think that it is for others to answer your correspondent's wholesale attack on the local clergy and would only say that it does seem to me to be unfair on such men, to name only two, as the Vicar and Curate of St. Mark's who are known and respected by the poor and coloured population of their Parish.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

L. G. THIRKELL.

Councillor, Norland Ward,
Royal Borough of Kensington.

(Our North Kensington Correspondent writes:—"*To answer Mr. Thirkell's charge of inaccuracy is difficult when most of his letter is taken up with what is nothing less than a proof of what I wrote. He admits that the Council will only take proceedings where the tenant is willing, which is exactly my complaint when I say that 'the Council has the power to bring cases . . .* without reference to the tenant or the landlord, *but (it) refuses to do so'.*

"*Let us consider some of the relevant facts. The rents in Kensington are higher on the average than in the other five boroughs which go to make up the West London Rent Tribunal (including Chelsea), and it is generally accepted by social workers and others that these high rents are a source of misery. It is not surprising that* 60% *of the cases dealt with by the Tribunal come from Kensington, and most of these from North Kensington. It is true that it was agreed unanimously to take proceedings when the tenant was willing; it is also true that Labour members would like to have gone further and use the powers which neighbouring boroughs use to bring cases without reference to the tenant. In the first few weeks of this year, two boroughs which are in the area of the W.L.R.T. brought two and six cases respectively to the Tribunal, either with or without the tenant's consent. Might we not reasonably expect to find that Kensington had done the same, at any rate where the tenant was willing? In fact, enquiries show that the Kensington Borough Council has NEVER brought a single case in the last two years, that is, since the Tribunal was constituted as it is at present! Of course, it is not surprising if tenants will not allow their cases to go before the Tribunal: has Mr. Thirkell never heard of the threats and intimidation which some landlords employ? And every landlord in Kensington knows that if a case goes before the Tribunal, it is with the tenant's consent.*

"*The reasons which Mr. Thirkell gives for this limitation are thin in the extreme. If it would be an interference with the liberties of the subject, perhaps he would tell us why the Council is prepared to take cases under the Public Health Acts without reference to the tenant. 'Reasons' (b) and (c) are too ludicrous and fantastic for comment.*

"*Finally, I made no wholesale attack on the clergy, but only said that in the worst area, 'the clergy seem happy to hibernate in a cocoon of the worst kind of eclectic, unevangelical Anglo-Catholicism'. I believe this to be true. But St. Mark's is not by any means in the worst area, nor does its church life merit this description*"—EDITORS.)

PRISM

Dear Sir,

I feel the February (sex) issue of *Prism* strikes such a wise and enlightened note that I feel a need to be sure of seeing it regularly in future. I particularly liked Elizabeth Montefiore's article.

Yours sincerely,

ELEANOR GRAHAM.

(*So did many other readers*—EDITORS.)

WHY REPENT?

Dear Sirs,

If *Two Years in Tufton Street* is to be read as an expression of repentance—of asking "What is wrong with the Church?" I am over-awed at the prospect of you, or indeed anyone, understanding "the eternal significance of the Church". That, even if it were fully possible, would be dangerous, unless balanced by a complementary understanding of the ease with which fallible Christians can tailor a cloak for their short-comings out of the very fact of that significance. Paradoxically, a disposition to ask what is wrong with the Church's earthly manifestation might indicate an appreciation of her true nature.

That is why I would question some of the things you say you have learnt. If by the "Sacramental Life" you mean simply the administration of the sacraments, then I emphatically dis-

agree that it suffices to say that "the work of the Church in the world is going on; and it is there for anyone to take part in". That is rather like saying that once the farmer has sown his seed there is no more to be done. The hidden life of the seed does not, without human co-operation, feed the world; is it otherwise with the invisible operation of the Blessed Sacrament? Much working out needs to be done. It is no use expecting the unbelieving world to see and be converted by an invisible operation. It must see, in the baker's shop window, tangible evidence that its hunger may be satisfied—even perhaps to make it aware of that hunger.

There have been times when the well-baked loaves in the shop window were provided by the lives of outstanding individuals—the Saints. But I believe that nowadays ordinary Christians are being called upon to work out the implications of the common life of the Church much more fully and visibly. For this reason I think there is a serious gap both in your suggested methods of spreading the Gospel and in your diagnosis of the world's rejection of our message. You indicate, I think rightly, that the way of personal contact is more excellent, because more costly, than the way of committees, but you say not a word about the personal contact of Church people one with another. Yet, supposing you induce your non-Christian friend to come to church, what will he find there? Will he find people who have a lively concern for him and for one another, into whose fellowship he may be drawn? Or will he find people patting themselves on the back for enjoying a talk on (somebody else's) Delinquent Children?

Again, you say very truly that we have left the study of family relationships too much to the enemies of Christianity. But does not the world remain unconverted partly because it is waiting to see people for whom the family, like patriotism, is not enough? No-one, by merely looking at us, would ever suppose that we follow a Lord to whom those who do the will of God meant even more than his own kinsfolk. Seen in that light, our experiments at what we call "Christian community" seem timid and tepid. Giving ourselves away to others is, as you say, costly—and it may be dangerous; that is why we do not do more of it.

St. Paul tells us that it is through the things that are made that the invisible things of God are clearly seen. How is our disintegrating society to see the invisible Communion of Saints except in and through our corporate life in the Church on earth? And is there any other aspect of the Faith which it more desperately needs to see?

Yours sincerely,

ELEANOR TARVER.

CLAPHAM COMMON.

TWO SORTS OF SEX

Dear Sirs,

On seeing "The Church and Sex" on the cover of *Prism*, I looked forward to reading what I hoped would be an imaginative and bold treatment of the subject. My hopes were fulfilled in one or two of the articles, but it was a pity to find both the editorial opening gambit, and the review of Martin Jarrett-Kerr, C.R. advocating the old traditional attitude, shorn of its more extreme absurdities, dished up in modern jargon—in spite of disclaimers to the contrary. Obviously a Religious is not married, but it would be interesting to know whether either of the Editors are!

A battle is rapidly developing between "relational sex" — horrid phrase—headed by Dr. Sherwin Bailey and "the Rest". Regrettably you appear to be numbered among the legion ranks of the rest, an unusual place for you. This is a gross oversimplification but it serves the purpose. It seems to me that a line of enquiry that treats relational sex seriously, is likely to benefit the Church infinitely more than attempting to dress up old ideas, in new clothes. You are content to relegate "discussion of Sex to the secondary plane upon which it has for so long rested", while your reviewer airily dismisses Sherwin Bailey's thinking on the subject as superficial—an easy way of getting round a subject, which possibly he does not understand.

Sex cannot be relegated to a secondary plane; it is at least of equal importance with all other aspects of loving, and consideration of it should be primary, for it is in sexual love that relationship between mortal beings can

be experienced at its most sublime. That relationship is best summed up in the terminology of Buber's "I"—"Thou". It is from the establishment of relationship at this level that true loving harmony, within marriage, will flow. There is indeed a difficulty in giving verbal expression to this, for it can only be known existentially. This does not mean, however, that it should therefore be dismissed. To delve into this subject here would be too tedious, but I hope that you may be persuaded to give it a second chance yourselves.

May I also humbly suggest that you should now go on to devote a whole number to a consideration of the Christian theological definition of marriage? To devote a whole issue to sex, without having done this first or at the same time seems to me to beg the whole question of marriage anyway.

Yours sincerely,
IPSWICH. (Rev.) DICK H. R. JONES.

Books

THE FOUR LOVES by C. S. LEWIS. *Bles*, 12s. 6d.

They are, of course, Affection, Friendship, Eros and Charity. Our century almost reveals the France of Bossuet and Fenelon in its preoccupation with the great theme of Pure Love. It is for us a more palatable presentation of the Catholic/Protestant debate than the pure Lutheran form. Nygren set it going with his *Eros and Agape* and Fr. D'Arcy has contributed to the discussion with his *Mind and Heart of Love*. Nor must we forget that fine book of Dom Aelred Graham *The Love of God*.

Now Dr. Lewis has taken it all forward another stage by his important admission that he could not "deny the name *love* to Need-love". The book is as beautifully written as ever: is the product of genuine thinking about real life: and deals with the questions we all ask. It strikes a real and manly Christian blow for poor old *Friendship*, and does something to rescue it from the diabolical smear campaign of recent years. He has more to say about the bottom of the scale than the top. If we could say anything about Charity, the divine word would not have taken our flesh and lived and died among us.

This is a fine book and a moving commentary on that

—love to the loveless shown
that they may lovely be—

of which the Puritan poet, Crossman, so finely sang. G.L.P.

ROMAN AND UNCONDEMNED by DUDLEY SYMON. *Faith Press*, 12s. 6d.

This is a vigorous book, ranging discursively over both the Roman Catholic Church which, the author claims, nowadays is not particularly Catholic or Roman but rather Italianate and Totalitarian; and the Church of England, which is more Roman than it likes to think. A way towards re-union is suggested by a mutual recognition of these facts, and by an attempt to get back to the broad "Romanism of the New Testament and the Early Church".

To the author, the word "Roman" implies the qualities of responsibility, of conservatism, of self-criticism and energy. The author writes in this true Roman style. N.M.

LITERATURE FOR THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION. *S.P.C.K.*, 2s. 6d.

Why should one feel so depressed after reading this superbly presented factual account, Province by Province, of how the church is spreading itself through the world. Perhaps it is the small things, such as the lack of running headlines to remind us of which province we are discussing, or the daunting Challenge to Action (=the cash we want) at the end of each section. Perhaps it is the thought that capital for investment is not enough, continuous giving is required—and yet thousands have made their fortunes out of that interesting religious

symposium, the Bible, and one is conditioned to think that what doesn't pay its way doesn't carry its message: profitability is not the only test of successful communication but it is *a* test. Perhaps the use of the word "literature" is ambiguous. In the context it means just lots of words, but normally it means lots of *good* words, a very different thing. Literature in the latter sense cannot be produced by subsidies, and not all literate Christians produce it by any means. Propaganda and instruction cannot be real literature, or only by inspired accidents. Christian literature, of which we are as short here as they are in Polynesia, is a rare and wonderful thing. Perhaps one is worried by the evidence of ingrowing attitudes; "secular shops" are distinguished from religious shops, the degree of inter-church co-operation, though greater than here, is small enough to weaken the impact of the message of the love of Christ which all Christians carry. "The Roman Catholic Church uses the secular press as a vehicle for religious articles, and Anglicans could well follow suit." So they could, but the Romans were in first, and perhaps have better writers or at any rate better contacts with editors. "The Bishop of Mashonaland reminds us that the Anglican work is only a very small part of the total Christian effort." "The greatest need is for 'spiritual' books (e.g. *The Imitation of Christ*), lives of the saints and material on Christian deviations, especially Jehovah's Witnesses." "The Roman Catholics and D.R.C. (Dutch Reformed) are active in this field, the Methodists to a lesser extent, but what they produce is rarely suitable for Anglican use.

Jehovah's Witnesses flood the market with all kinds of literature, and the multifarious sects all issue their own material.

There is a very lively Islamic propaganda centre in Durban, and the Hindu apologists are putting out literature there also."

In West Africa Jehovah's Witnesses and Islam are on the march. Periodicals, often started to explain the Christian religion to non-Christians, form quickly into Church papers for Church people. It's depressing, even though it's meant to be challenging.

Hasn't the whole missionary concept gone wrong somewhere? Haven't we to find Christ in other people, either at home or abroad, rather than bring Him to them? And what about home? The young Nigerian who commented smilingly on Television recently on empty churches in England "where the missionaries come from" and full churches in his home country, cannot be gainsaid. Our Lord preached, and taught his disciples to do the same. But they did not have to resolve their own doubts first, like we do, and if He were here now, wouldn't his instructions be a bit different? R.D.

The Future of Missions

The approaching independence of Congo has raised the question of the future of Christian missions in the territory, and in a survey issued recently of the various Protestant groups the dependence of the country on missions for education and welfare is fully revealed.

Catholic and Protestant missions carry most of the Congo's educational burden, particularly at the elementary levels. The Protestant missions have 126,525 *children in* 1,046 *schools recognised by the Government education service, and another* 219,414 *children in* 6,934 *simpler schools run by the missions themselves without Government aid. These schools employ more than* 11,000 *African teachers.*

The future of missionaries coming from foreign countries will be discussed when the Congo becomes independent, but so far there are no indications that they will be asked to leave. Protestant missionaries number 2,511, *of whom more than one-fifth are single women working in schools, hospitals, and dispensaries. They work with* 576 *ordained Congo pastors and* 8,957 *evangelists and catechists.*

The adult church membership of the Protestant churches in the Congo is 823,973, *with another* 378,559 *enrolled as probationers.*

GUARDIAN—18 March.

With a Man from Congo

(This is a transcript of a conversation between Christopher Martin and Robert Wayte, an ordinand who used the time before his formal training to work in the Belgian Congo for Gospel Recordings, Inc. He is now in his second term at Westcott House, Cambridge.)

MARTIN. *How did you spend your time during your two years in the Congo?*

WAYTE. I went round in a jeep from place to place, carrying a tape recorder, in order to get the Gospel of Jesus Christ on to records in various African languages. I undertook this in the belief that the gospel should be preached in every language and dialect.

So you were using African Christians to do the translating?

That's right. I used to have scripts in English tailor-made to fit one side of the disc. The missionaries then translate these into the languages that they know, and then the Africans into their tribal language, and I record them speaking it.

But is this much use? Have they got any gramophones?

Yes; many of them have gramophones already, and our branch in Australia produces cheap gramophones. Some of them are hand-operated: you turn a handle and the record goes round.

And what do you put on the records?

Simple sermonettes adapted for them, bible stories with their application, as well as conversations, usually between a Christian and a non-Christian, ending with the non-Christian accepting the gospel.

How does this tie up with regular missionary work?

The recordings are what the missionary leaves behind in the villages between his visits there. He's been preaching at some out of the way place, and after he has gone, the villagers start saying, "Well, what was he talking about?" So they can put on the record and hear the gospel again.

You have got some hope then that they will be treated with respect, and not thrown away as dangerous white man's magic?

They will be treated with respect all right, as this is something in their own language, and that is still pretty terrific for tribal Africans. For some of them this is the first time that they have heard the gospel in their own language.

Then all previous attempts to evangelize must have been fairly ineffective?

Exactly. You can say that of the 12 million population of the Congo, a fair number of the men and practically all the women would previously not have understood a word.

Did you then consider your main task to spread the gospel to the complete heathen, or take up from ineffective Roman Catholic missionary work?

We considered our task was to preach to the heathen, which also meant preaching to those who would call themselves Catholics, but in thought and practice were still heathen.

Did you have any experience of Roman Catholic missions yourself?

Yes. Once, when I found myself with night coming on, and I

hadn't got enough petrol in my jeep to get to the nearest Protestant mission, I risked putting up at a Catholic one. When I said who I was, I was half expecting to be slung out. In fact they proved very hospitable. They told me they had very friendly relations with the neighbouring Protestant mission, whose members used to drop in whenever they were passing. To my astonishment one of them produced a magazine of theirs called *Le Christe au Monde* which contained an interview with the Head of Gospel Recordings; and the report on our work was highly favourable.

Wasn't this surprising? Didn't you expect militant anti-Protestantism?

No, because Congo is protected by international agreements, which specify the freedom of religion. In certain cases, this has had to be invoked against some Roman Catholic practices.

Did you then find yourself embarrassed by curious native Protestant sects?

First off, the native sects are so distorted that one cannot say that their origin is specifically Protestant, or Roman Catholic. I didn't come across them all that much. But I did hear of one particular one, called Kibanguism, or the cult of the black Messiah. The basis of it was that the white people had their white Saviour, Jesus Christ, and the blacks thought they should have a black Saviour. When it started the whole of one mission station went over to it, and large parts of others followed; in fact it became quite widespread.

And this, I take it, has a distinct nationalist tendency.

Not so much nationalist, as that the black man wanted his own religion. Other sects have based much of their appeal on driving out the white man, and others on getting hold of the magic which the white man has, by which he produces all his wonders of civilisation, such as cars, radios, fine clothes, etc.

Then how far were you up against the spread of Islam?

I got the impression that they did not know what Islam was, and thought that it was just another denomination of Christianity. I even had one chap who called himself a Moslem, who had no objection to making gospel records in which he exhorted people to believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God as their Saviour. But on the whole you just don't find Moslems in the Congo. The government has seen to that. A few have come into the East as a result of the Arab slave-trade, but they don't seem to be very missionary minded.

Do you think that the missionaries' time is very limited?

The Missionaries are working on that assumption, and are trying to get the Africans to take responsibility for their own Churches. They are seeing the drawbacks of the original policy, when missionaries tended to surround themselves with yes-men; and now they are finding it difficult to get men of initiative to take over leadership.

What then do you think the permanent effect will be, assuming that the white missionaries have to leave?

I don't know.